

Serial No. **10/025,854**

Docket No. **SCH-0007**

Amendment dated May 23, 2006

Reply to Office Action of February 27, 2006

REMARKS

Entry of the amended claims is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution without incorporating additional subject matter); (3) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; and/or (4) place the application in better form for appeal (if necessary). Entry is thus requested.

By the present response, Applicant has canceled claims 4, 11, 12 and 16 without disclaimer. Further, Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 8, 10 and 15 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 13-15 and 17-21 remain pending in this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claim 1, has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,729,536 (Doshi et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,867,494 (Krishnaswamy). Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Krishnaswamy and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,037 (Kramer et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 5,953,339 (Baldwin et al.). Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Krishnaswamy and further in view of

Kramer, Baldwin and U.S. Patent No. 6,545,425 (Victor). Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Krishnaswamy and further in view of Kramer and Victor. Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Krishnaswamy and further in view of Kramer, Baldwin and U.S. Patent No. 5390198 (Higgins). Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Krishnaswamy and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,873,689 (Butler et al.).

Claims 8-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,583,737 (Schrodinger), Krishnaswamy, Victor and Butler. Claims 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Schrodinger, Krishnaswamy, Victor and Butler and further in view of Higgins. Claims 15 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Schrodinger, Victor and Krishnaswamy. Claims 16, 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Schrodinger, Victor and Krishnaswamy and further in view of Baldwin. Claims 20 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Schrodinger, Victor, Krishnaswamy and further in view of Higgins. Claim 14 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 4 contains allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Krishnaswamy. Applicant has amended this claim with the limitations from claim 4, deemed allowable by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this claim is patentable over the cited references at least for these reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 1 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Krishnaswamy and further in view of Kramer and Baldwin. Applicant submits that this claim is dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of

claim 2 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Krishnaswamy and further in view of Kramer, Baldwin and Victor. Applicants submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 3 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claims 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Krishnaswamy and further in view of Kramer and Victor. Applicants submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 5 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in

Amendment dated May 23, 2006

Reply to Office Action of February 27, 2006

view of Krishnaswamy and further in view of Kramer, Baldwin and Higgins. Applicants submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 6 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Krishnaswamy and further in view of Butler. Applicants submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 7 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claims 8-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Schrodinger, Krishnaswamy, Victor and Butler. Claims 11 and 12 have been canceled therefore rendering these rejections moot. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding claim 8, Applicants submit that this claim has been amended with subject matter from claim 4, deemed allowable by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this claim is patentable over the cited references at least for these reasons,

Regarding claim 10, Applicants submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 8 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 8 and 10 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Schrodinger, Krishnaswamy, Victor and Butler and further in view of Higgins. Applicants submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 12 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 13 and 14 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 15 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Doshi in view of Schrodinger, Victor and Krishnawamy. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding claim 15, Applicants submit that this claim has been amended with the limitations of claim 4, deemed allowable by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this claim is patentable over the cited references at least for the same reasons.

Regarding claim 17, Applicants submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 15 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 15 and 17 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 16, 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Schrodinger, Victor and Krishnaswamy and further in view of Baldwin. Applicants have canceled claim 16 therefore rendering this rejection moot. Regarding claims 18 and 19, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 15 and therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any

proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claim 18 and 19 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 20 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Schrodinger, Victor and Krishnamwy and further in view of Higgins. Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 15 and therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claim 20 and 21 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. **10/025,854**

Docket No. **SCH-0007**

Amendment dated May 23, 2006

Reply to Office Action of February 27, 2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing Amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 13, 14 and 17-21 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg

Date: May 23, 2006

\\Fk4\Documents\2064\2064-003\88367.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610